DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 991 HE 015 229

AUTHOR Olliver, James
TITLE The States and Independent Higher Education: Policies, Programs and Planning for the 1980s. A Research Report from the State-National Information Network.
INSTITUTION National Inst. of Independent Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 82
NOTE 21p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 601, Washington, DC 20036.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Planning; College Students; Comparative Analysis; *Financial Support; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Private Colleges; *Public Policy; *State Aid; State Programs; State Surveys; *Student Financial Aid

ABSTRACT

Policies, programs, and planning pertaining to the state-private college relationship in the 1980s are examined. The types of state support and policy implications of the funding options are outlined, and a compendium of the different programs in the states is presented. The popularity of the large public-independent need-based programs (e.g., New York, Illinois, and California) gave way in the late 1960s and early 1970s to need-based programs for independent college students only (e.g., South Carolina and Indiana), and to degree reimbursement programs (e.g., Oregon, Michigan, and New York). Later in the decade of the 1970s non-need-based aid to independent colleges became popular (e.g., North Carolina, Virginia, and Florida). A fourth approach, actually a variation of earlier themes, is the evolving pattern of formulas that tie the funding level for the independent sector (either institutional or student aid) to the per student support in the public sector. Specific types of state support for independent colleges/students are identified under the categories of direct institutional aid, indirect institutional aid, and student aid. In outlining the policy implications of the various funding options, the underlying assumption is that states develop funding programs in light of clear state purposes and a detailed understanding of the role and condition of the independent sector. The compendium of the different programs in the states provides an overview of the range and extent of support available to independent colleges, and students attending them. This listing provides brief program descriptions and funding levels. Planning issues include: the way the independent sector is involved in planning, data collection, program review and approval, and accountability. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219991

niicu

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NIICU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A Research Report From The

STATE-NATIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK

HE015229

The States and Independent Higher Education:

Policies, Programs and Planning for the 1980s

by James Olliver
Dean of Administration
Pfeiffer College
North Carolina

April 1982

A Research Report from the
STATE - NATIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK

National Institute of
Independent College and Universities
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 601
Washington, D.C. 20036

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The State and Independent Higher Education: Policies, Programs and Planning for the 1980s 1

Appendix A (Types of State Support For Independent Colleges/Students) A1

Appendix B (State Policy Toward Independent Higher Education: Goals Strategies and Implications) B1

Appendix C (State Support for Independent Higher Education, 1980-81) C1

THE STATES AND INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION: POLICIES, PROGRAMS AND PLANNING FOR THE 1980s*

Independent higher education is at a proverbial crossroads, again; it's future is a perennial question mark. In the 1970s, the growth of state and especially federal student aid served to sustain independent college choice, and to bring equilubrium to the percentage of students enrolled in the private sector.

But the apparent Camelot of the Federal Education Amendments of 1980 has evaporated, and in the matter of funding, and the equally important areas of planning and policy development, it is the state level "where the action is"; where our willingness to sustain that National love affair with the dual system will be debated and ultimately decided.

Clark Kerr in Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education - the Final Report of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies (Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980) characterizes the decade ahead as "a state period in terms of new initiative and responsibility for the welfare of higher education" (p. 119). "Financial support from the states," the Carnegie Panel concludes," will be the most dependable component in the future as in the past" (p.17).

This much is clear: State policy will determine the future of independent higher education as we have known it.

The outlook on the federal level is dismal. One veteran observer warns that we are faced with difficulties unparalleled since the Korean War when enrollments dropped sharply. Among the cutbacks, delays and uncertainties facing us are the following:

- o Pell Grant troubles--behind in the printing of applications, in the approval of a family contribution schedule, in deciding how the funds will be distributed, and in how to eliminate more students from the program.
- o Guaranteed Student Loans--more upheaval is coming. The loan program expires in June of 1982 and the Administration wants to overhaul the program, possibly sending it to the Treasury Department. The $30,000 income cap/needs test provisions passed last year will not save enough money.
- o Campus-based programs face the threat of further cuts and the possibility of block grants.
- o The Education Department, will we have one? Where will the programs be scattered? Who will be an advocate?

---

* An Address to the Committee on Independent Postsecondary Education of the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, Senate Office Building, Tallahassee, FL, 10 November 1981.

An important thing to remember is that the federal student aid programs, because they are tuition sensitive, are proportionately more critical to the independent sector. The impact of any cutbacks, delays or uncertainties will be felt most directly and forcefully by these institutions.

Given the primary role of the states in shaping the future of the post-secondary landscape, the framing of initial policy questions has a profound impact on the contours of the system that evolves.

The fundamental concern is simply stated:

- o What are the general policy goals for postsecondary education in the state, i.e., what in broad terms, does the state wish to achieve (with state support)? And more specifically...

- o How do independent colleges (or state colleges) contribute to the achievement of these goals?

Most responses to these general policy concerns focus on the state's obligation to use all resources most efficiently to render effective service for those seeking postsecondary education; assuring both quality and a diversity of educational environments in the process.

This approach undercuts the assumption on the part of any institution or set of institutions that there is a constitutional or historical basis for making first claim on the public treasury.

In reality, public instituions are viewed as the first responsibility of the state. The merits of this consideration aside, I believe that the secondary role afforded to the independent sector has led to some unfortunate and misdirected statements of the issue, i.e., looking at how state policy toward the independent sector works divorced from any concern about how policy considerations affecting both sectors will impact. For example, the policy of low tuition in the public sector (and any proposed changes in it) has as direct and substantial a bearing on the independent sector as questions on tuition grants. Most of the policy issues do, in fact, have ramifications for both sectors, and should be viewed accordingly in the planning process.

I think we can dispense with a lengthy discussion on whether states' interest and purposes are served by independent colleges. They clearly are, and the multitude of aid programs bears witness to that fact. the reasons are substantial:

- o Independent colleges are public resources in that they serve the educational needs of the citizenry.

- o They have a major economic impact locally and statewide in addition to the historical place they hold and contributions they

make to the social, cultural and religious fabric of their home communities.

- o To the extend that enrollment is growing, independent colleges save the state money by educating residents at a fraction of what it would cost the state to provide a similar educational service at a public institution.

- o They are special purpose institutions meeting a defined and otherwise unmet need or colleges of arts and sciences. The typical American ocllege graduate will work in three different careers and seven different jobs between college and retirement. An educational background in the liberal arts and sciences is designed to help students learn how to learn, to grow and to make the transititons our technological age demands.

- o They are primarily small institutions which promote the personal support and involvement some students need to develop.

- o Their church affiliations mean an instututional intention to live by a set of values and commitments.

Independent colleges serve as an alternative, an element of diversity, a protection against a monolithic system and a constant measure against which other public institutions can test themselves.

The state, then, must look at the accomplishments it hopes to achieve, the resources available to meet these goals, and who (which institutions) are able to do the job most efficiently and effectively.

The issue that receives the most attention in these dicussions is the matter of funding as it relates to defined state purposes.

Appendix A outlines the types of state support provided. There are generally two types of aid: support for the institutions (with an emphasis on a strong system of institutions) and support for students (with an emphasis on the free market). Most states with strong independent colleges have enacted a mix of programs.

Appendix B outlines the policy implications of the various funding options. The underlying assumption is that states develop funding programs in light of clear state purposes and a detailed understanding of the role and condition of the independent sector.

Appendix C is a compendium of the different programs in the states. It provides a good overview of the range and extent of support available to independent colleges, and students attending them, across the nation. This listing provides brief program descriptions and funding levels, but doesn't provide any sense of trends or movement.

I believe there is a pattern, a noticeable shift of direction, in the funding policies for independent higher education. First, there were the large public-independent need-based programs. New York enacted a program early this century; others followed in the 1950s and 1960s (e.g., Illinois and California). The popularity of this approach gave way in the late 60's and early 1970s to need-based programs for independent college students only (e.g., South Carolina and Indiana), and to degree reimbursement programs (e.g., Oregon, Michigan and New York). Later in the decade of the 1970s non-need-based aid to independent college students became popular, (e.g., North Carolina, Virginia and Florida).

A fourth approach, actually a variation on earlier themes, is the evolving pattern of formulas which tie the funding level for the independent sector (either institutional or student aid) to the per student support in the public sector. Maryland's institutional aid program is set at 20 percent; New Jersey has established 25 percent as the funding level. In Texas the need-based student grants have a maximum set at 50 percent of the public sector subsidy. In Louisiana the legislature authorized a similar program with a maximum equal to 100 percent of the subsidy. In North Carolina the legislature voted to extend independent college students "a reasonable percentage" of the state subsidy by 1985-86. Other states have similar proposals in the hopper (e.g., Ohio and Oklahoma).

The popularity of these latter two approaches (non-need-based and formula grants) may well stem from the fact that they are more easily understood by legislators, and appear to build an equity into the funding process. They speak to the primary concern of many representing the independent sector: a frontal attack on the tuition gap or difference in the cost of attendance between the sectors.

In addition to funding questions, there are a series of general planning issues. How is the independent sector to be involved? To what extent? Who is to take the leadership in drawing institutions and sectors into a coherent system (i.e., master planning)? Answers to these questions vary among the states based on fiscal, education, political, legal and demographic constraints.

Should the independent sector be involved? Certainly. As a recipient of state support, the independent colleges must take the responsibility of participation. Failure to communicate leading to a rise in the level of tension between the sectors serves no one's interest--both sectors lose if there is not mutual cooperation and trust. The quality of the interaction between the sectors depends on the extent to which the independent sector is organized to be a meaningful participant in the planning process. Both sectors benefit from a strong association of independent colleges.

Who takes the leadership? The answer again, varies by state, but a natural choice is a coordinating board which can engage the multitude of

actors in the art of compromise. It must be viewed as a truly neutral and objective agency, one which is respected and has the power to command allegiance.

How should the independent sector be involved? Participation comes through a variety of structures: a committee of presidents, voting membership on planning bodies, committees of trustees, etc. The mechanism is not really as important as the element of good will and trust, the degree of meaningful involvement, and the extent to which the process is accomplished within the context of an overall plan. Again, the importance of a well-organized independent college association is evident.

What are the key issues which must be addressed by the sectors during the planning process? Clearly, funding is the number one concern. Of equal importance is the matter of enrollment--from the vagaries of projection methodology to institutional "allocations." The matter of institutional cooperation should be reviewed, especially in this era of fiscal constraint.

Collection of data becomes an issue. What is needed (for planning purposes)? Why? How can it be obtained with a minimum of time and effort? How can both sectors be assured that data supplied won't be issued in another form in opposition to funding requests?

A touchy subject in many states is the matter of independent sector program review and approval. The importance of neutrality and trust is paramount here, and in states where agencies have achieved this level of respect (e.g., New York) the program review process is much less volatile.

The need for accountability is another concern. While the independent colleges are already accountable to state and federal agencies through codes and regulations and data requirements, and in a more general sense through the accreditation process, this need for "accountability" broadly defined is raised again and again. It's clear that there must be a different type or level of accountability due to the independence of independent college governing boards, and the significant differences in the funding levels of the two sectors. If the purpose of the aid is to promote diversity, accountability should not be the stick used to deny it.

"Public policy" cannot be viewed as a neat package of programs and directives established in grand fashion through careful deliberations. "Public policy" in the area of higher education, or "toward" any given sector in the overall system, exists--it's an amalgam of individual acts and decisions enacted and amended over time.

Florida appears to be in a position, both demographically and fiscally, to reach beyond the normal piecemeal approach--to entertain the "new initiatives" Clark Kerr envisioned. Where the cooperation necessary to forge a new consensus has worked, it has been accomplished through extensive dialogue and involvement of the independent sector. That's not the easy way, but it's the only way to achieve success.

Appendix A

TYPES OF STATE SUPPORT

FOR INDEPENDENT COLLEGES/STUDENTS

- o Direct Institutional Aid
  - Grants
    a. general (formula, entitlement) --
    b. categorical (specific purpose) --
  - Contracts
  - Loans (for construction)
- o Indirect Institutional Aid
  - Aid-in-kind (provisions of services)
  - Tax exemptions or credits
  - Bonding authority
- o Student Aid
  - Scholarships/Grants
    a. need-based (public and independent
    b. need-based (independent only)
    c. non-need based (public and independent
    d. non-need based (independent only)
  - Loans
  - Contracts
  - Work/Study programs
  - Tax credits for tuition payments

STATE POLICY TOWARD INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION: GOALS, STRATEGIES, and IMPLICATIONS

Appendix B

Goal	State Planning Approach	Possible Strategies
Maximum student access with reasonable choice	Student aid	Need-based student aid tends to equalize access among income groups. Tuition equalization grants tend to equalize access between public and independent sectors. A generous need-based student aid program that would aid students from middle-income families may eliminate the need for tuition-equalization grants.
	Institution centered	Institutional aid is not a significant strategy for access when an adequate institutional system already exists. However, contracts can be used as a strategy to insure access to specific programs otherwise unavailable in a given area.
An institutional system of high quality	Student aid	Student aid can help maintain institutional quality if students can select quality institutions without undue financial burdens.
	Institution centered	General institutional grant support contributes to maintenance of quality in the independent sector, as it does within the public sector.
Diversity	Student aid	Tuition grants broaden effective student choice and thus facilitate diversity.
	Institution centered	Contracts for specific educational programs may support distinctive and valuable programs and in some cases insure their maintenance at lower costs by independent institutions.
Efficiency	Student aid	Need-based student aid will insure access to independent institutions at the lowest level of state expenditure necessary to meet needs over and above family contribution. Tuition equalization grants produce benefits to the state in student access to independent institutions, with state outlay of aid used to cover a portion of costs. May be inefficient for students who do not need such grants to enable them to choose independent institutions.
	Institution centered	Institutional grants contribute to the efficient utilization of the independent sector in general. Contracts allow state utilization of specific independent sector programs, sometimes at less than comparable costs of direct state operation.

From: Education Commission of the States, Final Report and Recommendations: Task Force on State Policy and Independent Higher Education, Report No. 100 (June, 1977).

Appendix C

STATE SUPPORT FOR INDEPENDENT

HIGHER EDUCATION, 1980-81

Funding initiatives described in this compilation are primarily the major, general purpose scholarship grant programs, and the significant direct aid programs both categorical and non categorical. Wherever possible support for undergraduate programs and activities only have been cited. Excluded, therefore, are the six general graduate scholarship and grant programs in California, Connecticut, Michigan, New Jersey, New York and Texas and the categorical graduate assistance programs to either students and/or institutions in almost half the states (mostly in the medical field). Also excluded are bonding authorities for facilities or student loans.

Programs have been divided into three categories: (1) Direct Aid, (2) Student Aid (Independents only) and (3) Student Aid (State and Independents). The differing forms of assistance do not all fall neatly into these categories, and appropriate cross-references have been made. Brief descriptions of the programs in the first two categories are included. The need-based public/independent programs are well-described by others, and are therefore merely listed here. No programs authorized, but not funded, have been included.

The dollar figures following each program title/description reflect 1980-81 appropriations. Descriptions of the programs themselves include information for 1981-82, and, in some cases, projections for 1982-83.

DIRECT INSTITUTIONAL AID (RELATING TO UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION) - CATEGORICAL AND NONCATEGORICAL

- Alabama: Unrestricted appropriations to four independent institutions. ($2.5million)

- Connecticut: Contract Students w/Independent Colleges. (See: STUDENT ASSISTANCE-INDEPENDENT ONLY)

  Contractural Program - Contracts with independent colleges for programs and services, including cooperative arrangements. ($25,000)

- Florida: Contract in Appropriations Act - for the education of baccalaureate students in nursing of the University of Miami. ($326,000)

- o Illinois: Financial Assistance Act - Direct institutional aid based on FTE allocations -- $11.2 million in 1981-82.

- o Louisiana: Reimbursement grants - Payments made directly to independent colleges @ $180 per resident FTE per semester with a maximum of eight semesters for each undergraduate and eight semesters for each graduate or professional student. ($3.6 million)

- o Maryland: State Support to Nonpublic Institutions - Direct noncategorical payments to nonpublic institutions by formula: 20 percent of state general fund support per FTE at public 4-year colleges in 1980.

  Capital Funding - Maryland has a history of providing capital funds to independent colleges and universities. Capital improvements approved by the 1981 Legislature included: The John Hopkins University, $1.5 million for construction of phase III of a new biology building; Loyola College, $1.5 million for construction of an academic-fine arts facility; Mt. St. Mary's College, $800,000 for renovation of various utilities; Western Maryland College, $1.25 million for construction of a physical education teaching facility.

- o Massachusetts: Matching Scholarship Grants: (See: STUDENT ASSISTANCE - INDEPENDENT ONLY).

- o Michigan: Degree Reimbursement - Direct aid to independent institutions per number of degrees awarded. For 1981-82: $233 per associate degree, $466 per baccalaureate degree. ($2.7 million)

  Allied Health Grants - Reimbursements to independent institutions for degrees granted in allied health programs @ $995 per degree. ($410,000)

- o Minnesota: Contracts w/Independent Institutions - Direct payments to independent colleges based on a maximum $400 per grant-in-aid (GIA) recipient in 2-year institutions and $500/GIA recipient in 4-year institutions. Maximum grants for residents not receiving GIA are $150/student in 4-year institutions and $120/student in 2-yer institutions. ($4.7 million)

- o New Jersey: Independent College and University Assistance Program - This new formula funding plan, established by the 1979 Legislature, provides support to independent institutions on a per FTE New Jersey student basis at 25 percent of the per-student state support of New Jersey 4-year public institutions. Funds derived from the total pool of New

Jersey students in independent colleges are distributed to institutions as follows: 10 percent across-the-board, 35 percent for students receiving $1000 or more in aid, and 55 percent on the basis of New Jersey students enrolled. ($10.6 million)

Educational Opportunity Fund - Program Support - Direct aid to participating institutions for services rendered in administering EOF grants. ($950,000)

- o New York: Direct Institutional Aid (Bundy Aid) - Awards to independent institutions based on degrees conferred. 1980-81 awards were $1200 per baccalaureate degree: $450 per associate degree. ($48.5 million)

  Higher Education Opportunity Program (See: STUDENT ASSISTANCE - INDEPENDENT ONLY).

- o North Carolina: North Carolina Contract Grants (See: STUDENT ASSISTANCE - INDEPENDENT ONLY).

- o Oregon: Direct Aid to Independent Institutions - Direct grants to independent colleges through contracts for educational service: $570 for every 45 quarter hours of secular coursework completed. ($2.9 million)

- o Pennsylvania: Direct Aid to State-Aided Institutions - Support for 13 private (State-aided) institutions primarily focused on programs of benefit to the State. ($41.8 million)

  Institutional Assistance Grants - Direct assistance to eligible institutions (other than "state-aided") for each scholarship recipient enrolled. Authorization level at $450 per recipient. ($15.1 million)

  Institutional Aid for Remedial Programs - Grants to institutions with tutorial and remedial programs for disadvantaged students. ($1.6 million)

- o Rhode Island: Funds provided to Bryant College to train business teachers. ($8,000)

STUDENT ASSISTANCE - INDEPENDENT COLLEGE STUDENTS ONLY

Need-Based

- o Connecticut: Contract students w/Independent Colleges - Funds distributed to institutions based on FTE Connecticut undergraduates enrolled; must be used for need-based student assistance. The amounts to the institutions

cannot exceed one-half the difference in the average cost to the state of educating the same student. ($4.5 million)

- Indiana: Freedom of Choice Grants - For residents who attend independent colleges and whose need is not met by the maximum awards under Indiana's need-based public/independent grant program, with a maximum grant of $1450 (1982-83). ($4.0 million)

- Iowa: Tuition Grant Program - For residents attending independent or proprietary institutions, with a maximum of $1700 not to exceed tuition and fees minus the amount that would be paid at a state institution. ($14.8 million)

- Kansas: Tuition Grant Program - For residents attending independent colleges, with a maximum of $1100, tuition and fees, or need, whichever is less after the first $450 is paid by the student. ($4.1 million)

- Kentucky: Tuition Grants - Maximum grant of $850 for educational costs. ($3.0 million)

- Louisiana: Tuition Assistance Grants - New for 1982-83. Need-based tuition subsidy for residents enrolled in Louisiana's independent colleges, with the neediest student eligible for equivalent of state FTE subsidy at public institutions. (No funds have been appropriated for the 1982-83 academic year).

- Massachusetts: Matching Scholarship Grants - Institutions receive an amount equal to the scholarship assistance they are providing to needy Massachusetts full-time undergraduates. At least 75 percent of the funds must be given as financial aid to needy state residents - the remaining funds are used at the institution's discretion. ($3.7 million)

- Michigan: Tuition Grants - Awards to needy graduate and undergraduate state residents. Funding for 1980-81 provided for a $1300 maximum. (UG aid - $12.7 million)

- New York: Higher Education Opportunity Program - Funds allocated to independent institutions to assist them in providing special educational opportunity for financially and/or educationally disadvantaged students. Approximately 60 percent of the funds are to be used for student assistance. Institutions match $1.03 for every dollar. ($8.3 million)

- o North Carolina: North Carolina Contractual Grants - Each eligible institution recieves $200 per FTE resident undergraduate enrolled on October 1. The funds are placed by the institution in a separate account and used during that fiscal year solely to aid needy state residents. ($5.0 million)

- o North Dakota: Tuition Grant Program - Awards to needy undergraduates--new in 1979-80. The $100,00 appropriation in 1979-80 provided $500 to each of the 200 neediest students.

- o South Carolina: Tuition Grant Program - maximum of $2000 state assistance for tuition and fees, room and board charges. $1625 average award. ($11.9 million)

- o South Dakota: Tuition Equalization Grants - New program in 1979-80 providing up to $250 to needy state residents.

- o Texas: Tuition Equlization Grants - Awards to full and half-time undergraudates and graduate students up to a maximum of 50 percent of the state appropriation per student in the state colleges and universities. The maximum for 1981-82 and 1982-83 will be $1328. ($12.1 million)

- o Wisconsin: Tuition Grant Program - Awards to full and half-time undergraduates up to $2000. ($10.1 million)

VARIABLES: Maximum award (range $250-full need); items included in budget (tuition and fees only, tuition, fees, room and board, or all educational expenses); classes included (UG only, UG and G); credit houts (under-half, half-time, full- time students only), summer school eligibility (yes in MI, NC, SC, TX and WI).

Non-Need Based

- o Alabama: Alabama State Tuition Grants - $500 to each full-time resident enrolled. ($3 million)

- o Florida: State Tuition Voucher Fund - $750 to every freshman (1979-80), freshman and sophomore (1980-81, and freshman, sophomore and junior (1981-82) who attend a Florida independent college, were graduated from a Florida high school and have been residents of the state for two years. ($4.2 million in 1980-81; $7.3 million in 1981-82)

- o Georgia: Tuition Equalization Grants - $675 to each full-time resident undergraduate in 1981-82, with summer school students eligible for an additional $225. ($8.8 million)

- Michigan: Tuition Differential Grants - Each full-time freshman attending an independent college 1978-79 received a $500 award; each part-time freshman (6 hours or more) received $250. The program has now been completely phased in: one new class each year. ($9.1 million 1980-81 - $15.9 million 1981-82)

- North Carolina: North Carolina Legislative Tuition Grants - $600 to each state resident enrolled full-time, with a scheduled increase to $650/student in 1982-83. ($14.0 million)

- Virginia: Tuition Assistance Grant Program - $700 to each state resident enrolled full-time. ($7.3 million - 1980-81; $8.5 millon 1981-82)

ADDITIONAL VARIABLES: Phasing-in (by class, loans to grants), additional requirements, stronger language to discourage constitutional challenge.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE - STATE AND INDEPENDENT COLLEGE STUDENTS
(Need-Based unless otherwise noted. Amounts reflect dollars received by independent college students. Only in larger programs are dollar amounts specified.)

- Alabama: State Student Assistance Program

- Alaska: Scholarship Loan Program

- Arizona: Incentive Grant Program

- Arkansas: State Scholarship Program

- California: Cal Grant A (State Scholarships) ($49.6 million)
  Cal Grant B (College Opportunity Grants) ($6.9 million)
  Cal Grant C (Occupational/Training Grants)

- Colorado: State Student Incentive Grants

- Connecticut: State Scholarship Programs ($2.1 million)

- Delaware: Postsecondary Scholarship Fund

- District of Columbia: State Student Incentive Grant Program

- Florida: Student Assistance Grants - ($5.4 million)
  Legislative/Merit Scholars Program

- Georgia: Incentive Scholarship Program ($1.4 million)

- Hawaii: Student Incentive Grants - (matching private/federal funds)
- Idaho: Student Incentive Grants
  State Merit Scholarship Program
- Illinois: Monetary Award Program - ($60.9 million)
- Indiana: State Scholarship Program - ($6.3 million)
  Educational Grant Program - ($2.4 million)
  Top Twenty Scholars Program
- Iowa: State Scholarship Program
- Kansas: State Scholarships
- Kentucky: State Grants - ($1.6 million)
- Louisiana: State Student Incentive Grants
- Maine: Incentive Grants
- Maryland: General State Scholarships - ($1.3 million)
  Senatorial Scholarships
  House of Delegates Scholarships
  Distinguished Scholar Program
- Massachusetts: General Scholarships - ($12.3 million)
- Michigan: Competitive Scholarships - ($3.7 million)
- Minnesota: State Scholarship Program - ($5.7 million)
  Grants-in-Aid Program - ($7.6 million)
- Mississippi: State Incentive Grants - (matching private/federal funds)
- Missouri: Student Grant Program - ($8.0 million)
- Montana: Incentive Grants
- Nebraska: State Student Scholarship Program
- Nevada: Incentive Grants
- New Hampshire: Incentive Program
- New Jersey: Tuition Aid Grants - ($9.5 million)
  Garden State Scholars Program - (merit-based -$1.2 million)
  Educational Opportunity Grants - ($1.6 million)

- New Mexico: Incentive Grants
- New York: Tuition Assistance Program - ($116.8 million)
  Regents College Scholarship Program - (competitive and non-need based - $6.6 million)
- North Carolina: State Student Incentive Grants - ($1.4 million)
- North Dakota: Student Financial Assistance Program
- Ohio: Ohio Instructional Grants - ($12.5 million)
  Academic Scholarship Program - ($780,000)
  War Orphans Scholarships
  National Guard Grants
- Oklahoma: Tuition Aid Grants
- Oregon: Need Grants - ($1.2 million)
  Cash Awards
- Pennsylvania: Higher Education Grant Program - ($49.3 million)
- Rhode Island: Scholarship Program
  Grant Program - ($2.1 million)
- South Dakota: Incentive Grants
- Tennessee: Student Assistance Award Program - ($4.0 million)
- Texas: Student Incentive Grants - ($3.4 million)
- Utah: Incentive Grant Program
- Vermont: Incentive Grant Program - ($1.6 million)
- Virginia: College Scholarship Assistance Program - ($1.2 million)
- Washington: State Need Grant - ($1.2 million)
  State Work-Study Program - ($1.2 million)
- West Virginia: Higher Education Grants - ($1.5 million)
- Wisconsin: Indian Student Assistance
  Deaf and Visually Handicapped Aid
  Talent Incentive Grants

Note: Appropriations include federal SSIG funds where state match for independent college students is allowed by law.

For further information see:

- Education Commission of the States, Higher Education in the States, issue published annually on independent college assistance.

- National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs, Annual Survey, published in the fall.

- State-National Information Network of the National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, Report on State Legislative Activity, published annually in the summer.